DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Law Offices

HALEY, BADER & POTTS

4350 North Fairfax Dr., Suite 900 Arlington, Virginia 22203-1633 Telephone (703) 841-0606

Fax (703) 841-2345

Post Office Box 19006

Washington, D.C. 20036-9006

Telephone
(202) 331-0606

RECEIVED

JUL 1 6 1993

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SUSAN H. ROSENAU

July 16, 1993

By Hand Delivery
Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

OUR FILE NO. 0992-102-60

RE: MM Docket No. 93-42, Calistoga, California

Dear Mr. Caton:

On behalf of Moonbeam, Inc., an applicant (File No. BPH-911115MG) for a New FM Station on Channel 265A in Calistoga, California, please find the original and six copies of its Response to Opposition to Witness Notification in the above-referenced proceeding.

Kindly communicate any questions directly to this office.

Yours very truly,

Susan H. Rosenau

Enclosures (6)

cc: Moonbeam, Inc.
Robert Zauner, Esquire

A. Wray Fitch, Esquire

Administrative Law Judge Edward Luton

No. of Copies rec'd_ List A B C D E

Before The

Federal Communications Commission VUL 1 6 1993

Washington, D.C. 20554

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

| In re Applications Of | Docket No. MM 93-42 |
|---|-----------------------|
| MOONBEAM, INC. | File No. BPH-911115MG |
| GARY E. WILLSON | File No. BPH-911115MO |
| For a Construction Permit for a) New FM Station on Channel) 265A in Calistoga, California) | |

To: The Honorable Edward Luton Administrative Law Judge

Response to Opposition to Witness Notification

Pursuant to Section 1.248 of the Commission's Rules, Moonbeam, Inc. ("Moonbeam"), by its attorneys, respectfully responds to the Opposition to Witness Notification filed by Gary Willson ("Willson") on July 14, 1993, stating in support thereof as follows:

- 1. Willson has requested cross-examination of Mary F. Constant. See Witness Notification of Gary Willson, served July 9, 1993.
- 2. Section 1.248(d)(4) provides that "oral testimony and cross examination will be permitted only where, in the discretion of the presiding judge, material issues of decisional fact cannot be resolved without oral evidentiary hearing procedures or the public interest otherwise requires oral evidentiary proceedings." 47 C.F.R. §1.248(d)(4).

- 3. The foregoing rule does *not* provide for oral evidentiary proceedings limited to the specific parties and issues where need has been shown; once a material issue of decisional fact requiring hearing has been raised in a proceeding, a hearing with respect to *all* designated issues must be had, except those disposed of by motion for summary decision. In other words, the rule does not provide for one party's case to be submitted orally and the other parties' cases submitted in written form. The Presiding Officer must either conduct an oral hearing as to all parties or decide with respect to all parties based on the parties' written cases. Any other interpretation would violate the Due Process rights of the parties.
- 4. In any event, Moonbeam has a need to cross-examine Willson in this matter. Willson has, as recently as July 14, 1993, sought to comparatively upgrade his integration statement, see Erratum to Direct Case Exhibit No.1, filed July 14, 1993, to reflect new and additional civic activities. Moonbeam requires an opportunity to determine the extent to which these activities pre-dated Willson's application and the extent to which his participation in these activities is genuine, both of which are material issues of decisional fact.

5 Firther William has throughout this proceeding sought oredit

| • . | Moonbeam requires an opportunity to probe Willson's credibility |
|---|--|
| _ | and the state of t |
| Transition of the last of the | <u> </u> |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| <u> </u> | |
| , | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| ∤ ¬. | |
| | |
| | |
| J | |
| | |
| | |
| <u>-</u> | |
| • | |
| } | \ |
| 1 | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned, an employee of Haley, Bader & Potts, hereby certifies that the foregoing Response to Opposition to Witness Notification was mailed this date by First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, or was hand-delivered*, to the following:

A. Wray Fitch, III, Esquire Gammon & Grange 8280 Greensboro Drive McLean, VA 22102-3807

Administrative Law Judge Edward Luton 2000 L Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Robert Zauner, Esquire*
Federal Communications Commission
Mass Media Bureau, Hearing Branch
Suite 7212
2025 M Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

July 16, 1993